第９講　　SFC 超長文演習①

次の文章に関して，空所補充問題と読解問題の二つがあります。まず，［1］から［8］の空欄を埋めるのに，文脈的に最も適切な語を選びなさい。次に，内容に関する［9］から［14］の設問は，文章の内容から見て最も適切なものを選びなさい。

Since the middle of the twentieth century, there has been a revolution in the job market. Women have entered the paid workforce in unprecedented numbers. In 1950, for example, only about one-third of working-age women were in the paid workforce; today, some 61 percent are. There has also been an overwhelming change in the nature of paid work done by women. Fifty years ago, professional careers for women［1］（1. apropos　2. out　3. outside）of nursing or teaching were unusual. Today, women comprise nearly half of the newly minted attorneys and physicians starting work each year. Over the same fifty-year period, there has been a transformation of wages, too. In 1950, median earnings of women were only two-thirds those of men. Today, women earn 80 percent of what men are paid.

Reread that last sentence. On average, for every dollar a man earns, a woman gets paid 80 cents. Can this possibly be true? Consider this fact: Nearly 70 percent of employers' costs are accounted for by labor. An employer who hired only women at 80 cents on the dollar could cut labor costs by 20 percent［2］（1. in spite of　2. relative to　3. similar to）an employer who hires only men. This would yield added profits of about 14 percent of sales — which would triple the profit earned by the typical firm. If women are paid 20 percent less than men, how could any employer possibly［3］（1. expect　2. afford　3. refuse）to hire anyone but women?

今日のポイント

< 語彙 >

< 論理構成 >

At this point you may be saying to yourself, “Surely, there are differences between men and women other than their sex that can help account for this gender gap in earnings.” And you would be correct. Earnings are a reflection of experience, education, marital status, and age. But even when all of these variables have been controlled, nationwide data, such as from the U.S. Census Bureau or the Bureau of Labor Statistics, still show that unexplained differences between the pay of men and women persist. Men with the same measure individual characteristics are paid at least 10 percent more than women, and some studies find a difference twice [4] (1. that 2. as 3. much) size.

The widespread opinion of many observers is that the unexplained gap between the pay of men and women is chiefly the result of discrimination against women. The reasoning is simple. Most business owners or senior managers are men, and [5] (1. over 2. for 3. given) a choice between hiring a man or a woman, the “old-boy network” operates in favor of the man. According to this view, women can get the job only if they agree to accept lower wages.

Consider this fact, however: For more than forty years, it has been illegal to discriminate in the workforce on the basis of race or gender. As interpreted by the courts, the law now says that if the statistical appearance of lower wages for women or minorities is present in a workplace, the employer is presumed to be guilty of discrimination and must prove [6] (1. otherwise 2. it 3. so).

< 語彙 >

< 論理構成 >

No one thinks that federal agencies do a perfect job at enforcing the law here or elsewhere, but it is hard to believe that a persistent 20 percent pay difference could escape the notice of even the most [7] (1. oversight 2. farsighted 3. nearsighted) federal bureaucrat.

A hint of what might be going on begins to emerge when economists study the payroll records of individual firms, using actual employee information that is specific and detailed regarding location of the firm, type of work, employee responsibilities, and other factors. These analyses reveal that the so-called wage gap between men and women is much smaller — typically [8] (1. as much as 2. no more than 3. no less than) 5 percent — and often there is no gap at all. The sharp contrast between firm-level data and nationwide data suggests that something may be at work here besides outright gender discrimination.　(11 慶應義塾大　総合政策)

[Miller, RL, The Economics of Public Issues, 15th Ed, 2008. Reprinted by permission of Pearson Education, Inc.]

＜語彙＞	＜論理構成＞

［9］ In the 1st paragraph, the author uses the expression “a revolution in the job market” with respect to

１. the number of women in the paid workforce, the type of paid work women are engaged in, and the earnings of women.

２. the nature of the paid workforce, the number of female attorneys and physicians, and a transformation of wages.

３. professional careers for women, a change in the wage rate for women, and the number of attorneys and physicians.

４. the contribution to the labor force, diversity of professional skills, and wealth accumulated by women.

［10］ What is the main point of the 2nd paragraph?

１. Companies should hire more women than men because it can cut labor costs by 20%.

２. Hypothetically, hiring women would bring in more profit to the employer, but the reality is not as simple as that.

３. Due to lower earnings, an increasing number of companies are hiring more women than in the past.

４. The claim that women earn 80 percent of what men earn has no supporting evidence.

[11]　According to the article, what do the nationwide statistics (e.g., the U.S. Census Bureau) reveal?

１. There exists a lasting difference in earnings between men and women not fully accounted for by factors like experience and age.

２. There are a variety of individual factors causing the gender gap in earnings.

３. Gender differences in earnings are not as great as people generally assume.

４. Earnings are distributed according to experience, education, marital status, and age.

[12]　Which of the following best represents the concept of the "old-boy network" as used in the 4th paragraph?

１. A democratic system of within-company communication which exclusively consists of aged colleagues.

２. A predisposition of the male employer which influences his decision of hiring a male or a female.

３. A theory of communication which explains the old-men-flock-together phenomenon in a company.

４. A wisdom of human experience which directs human reasoning in the right direction.

[13]　On the relationship between the law and the gender discrimination, which of the following is not correct, according to the article?

１. It is illegal both in theory and in practice to discriminate in the workforce on the basis of gender.

２. Even the strict law-enforcement agencies can overlook a 20% difference in pay between men and women.

３. If there is statistical evidence for women receiving lower wages, the employer can be accused of discrimination.

４. The law that prohibits gender discrimination in the workforce is enforced by federal agencies.

[14]　What does the comparison between the nationwide data and the payroll records of individual firms show in relation to the wage difference between men and women?

１. Both data confirm that women receive 20 percent less wages than men.

２. The gender difference alone does not account for the wage difference between men and women.

３. The firm-level data are too specific to generalize about gender discrimination in terms of wages.

４. Different interpretations of the data are possible according to the location of the firm, the type of work, employee responsibilities and other factors.

大学別対策講座　慶應義塾大英語　復習テスト　第九回

下線部を日本語に訳しなさい。

１. Given a choice between hiring a man or a woman, the "old-boy network" operates in favor of the man.

男女の雇用の選択肢を（　　　　　　　　），オールドボーイネットワークが男性に（　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　）。

２. It has been illegal to discriminate in the workforce on the basis of race or gender.

（　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　）

３. As interpreted by the courts, the law says that if the statistical appearance of lower wages for women is present in a workplace, the employer is presumed to be guilty of discrimination.

（　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　）

空欄に適切な日本語，英語を書きなさい。

4	bureaucrat	
5	so-called	
6	comprise of	
7	outright	
8		代理人
9	median	
10	yield	
11		反映
12	marital	
13	census	
14	observer	
15	enforce	
16	federal	
17	unprecedented	
18		圧倒的な
19	payroll	
20	attorney	
21	physician	

NOTE

慶應義塾大英語　第９講　解答

<解答>

［1］ 3　［2］ 2　［3］ 2　［4］ 1

［5］ 3　［6］ 1　［7］ 3　［8］ 2

［9］ 1　［10］ 2　［11］ 1　［12］ 2

［13］ 2　［14］ 2

<全訳>

20 世紀の半ばから，労働市場においてある革命が起きている。女性が前代未聞の数で，労働力へと加わってきている。例えば，1950 年には，労働年齢の女性の約三分の一しか労働市場に加わっていなかった。今日は，およそ 61% が労働市場に加わっている。同様に女性が行う賃金労働の性質にものすごい変化が起きてきている。50 年前，女性にとって，看護師や教師を除いた職業は普通ではなかった。今日，女性は，毎年働き始める新人の弁護士や医者のほぼ半分を占めている。同じ 50 年の間に，賃金の変化も起きている。1950 年に，女性の平均的稼ぎは男性の３分の２しかなかった。今日は，女性は男性の給与の 80% の賃金を得ている。

最後の文を再び見てみよう。平均して，男性が１ドル稼ぐごとに，女性は 80 セント給料をもらえる。これは本当なのだろうか？　この事実をしっかり考えてみよう。雇用者の費用のほぼ 70% が労働によって占められている。１ドルあたり 80 セントで女性だけ雇う雇用者がいれば，男性しか雇わない雇用者と比べて，20% 雇用費を削減できる。このことにより，売り上げのうち，およそ 14% の利益を増やせるだろう。普通の会社が稼ぐ利益を三倍にできるのだ。もし女性が男性より 20% 少ない給料なら，どの雇用者が女性以外の誰かを雇う余裕があるというのだ。

この時点で，こう思うかもしれない。「確かに，こうした所得の性別による違いの理由を説明する助けとなる，性別以外の男女間の差がある。」そしてその意見は正しいであろう。所得は，経験，教育，配偶者の有無，年齢を反映するものだ。しかし，これらの変化するものすべてがコントロールされた時でさえ，全国規模でのデータ, 例えばアメリカ国勢調査局や労働統計局からのデータによると，男性と女性の賃金の説明されていない差がいまだに残っている。同じ尺度の個人

的特徴を備えた男性が，女性より少なくとも 10% 多く給与をもらえて，ある研究によると，その差は二倍となっている。

多くの評論家の広範な意見によると，男女間の説明されていない賃金差は，主に女性差別の結果であるということだ。理由は単純だ。ほとんどの事業主や重役たちは男性で，男性か女性かを雇用する選択肢があれば，「学閥」が，男性に味方して働く。この見解によると，女性は低い賃金を受け入れるよう同意した場合に限り，仕事につけることになる。

しかし, この事実をもっと考えてみよう。40 年以上の間ずっと違法だったのが, 人種，性別に基づいた職場での差別だ。裁判所の解釈によると，現在の法は，もし，女性や少数派の低賃金の統計的徴候が職場にあるのなら，雇用者は差別に責任があると見なされ，そうでないと証明しなければならない。誰も，法をどこで施行しようと，連邦政府が完ぺきな仕事をしているとは思わないが，信じがたいことに，根強く残る 20% の賃金差は最も近くで見ている連邦政府の役人の警告でさえ逃れることができるのだ。

起きていることのヒントが現れ始めるのは，経済学者達が，会社の位置や仕事の種類，労働者の責任，その他の要因に関して，明確かつ詳細な実際の従業員情報を使って，個々の会社の給与支払いの記録を研究するときだ。これらの分析で明らかになるのは，俗にいう男女間の賃金差が，ずっと少なくて，大体 5% しかなく，まったくその差がないケースも多いということだ。会社レベルのデータと国レベルのデータの間のはっきりした相違でわかるのは，あからさまな性差別以外に，何かが作用しているかもしれないということだ。

第９講　重要語彙リスト

1	workforce	労働力	12	relative to	～に比例して
2	unprecedented	先例のない	13	yield	生み出す
3	overwhelming	圧倒的な	14	reflection	反映
4	comprise of	～を構成する	15	marital	夫婦の
5	minted	つくり出された	16	variable	変わるもの
6	attorney	弁護士	17	census	国勢調査
7	physician	医者	18	persist	存続する
8	transformation	変化	19	observer	評論家
9	wage	賃金	20	discrimination	差別
10	median	中央値	21	reasoning	推論

11	account for	～を占める	22	operate	機能する
23	in favor of	～を好んで	30	enforce	施行する
24	illegal	違法な	31	bureaucrat	官僚
25	court	裁判所	32	emerge	出現する
26	statistical	統計上の	33	payroll	給与支払い
27	presume	推定する	34	so-called	いわゆる
28	federal	連邦政府の	35	outright	あからさまな
29	agency	機関			

第９講　音読用白文　①　②　③　④　⑤　⑥　⑦　⑧　⑨　⑩

Since the middle of the twentieth century, / there has been a revolution in the job market. Women have entered the paid workforce in unprecedented numbers. In 1950, for example, / only about one-third of working-age women / were in the paid workforce; today, some 61 percent are. There has also been an overwhelming change / in the nature of paid work / done by women. Fifty years ago, / professional careers for women / outside of nursing or teaching were unusual. Today, / women comprise nearly half of the newly minted attorneys and physicians / starting work each year. Over the same fifty-year period, / there has been a transformation of wages, too. In 1950, median earnings of women / were only two-thirds those of men. Today, women earn 80 percent of what men are paid.

Reread that last sentence. On average, / for every dollar a man earns, a woman gets paid 80 cents. Can this possibly be true? Consider this fact: Nearly 70 percent of employers' costs / are accounted for by labor. An employer / who hired only women at 80 cents on the dollar / could cut labor costs by 20 percent / relative to an employer who hires only men. This would yield added profits / of about 14 percent of sales ― which would triple the profit / earned by the typical firm. If women are paid 20 percent less than men, / how could any employer possibly afford to hire anyone but women?

At this point / you may be saying to yourself, / "Surely, there are differences between men and women / other than their sex / that can help account for this gender gap in earnings." And you would be correct. Earnings

are a reflection of experience, education, marital status, and age. But even when all of these variables have been controlled, / nationwide data, such as from the U.S. Census Bureau or the Bureau of Labor Statistics, / still show that unexplained differences / between the pay of men and women persist. Men / with the same measure individual characteristics / are paid at least 10 percent more than women, / and some studies find a difference twice that size.

The widespread opinion of many observers / is that the unexplained gap between the pay of men and women / is chiefly the result of discrimination against women. The reasoning is simple. Most business owners or senior managers are men, / and given a choice between hiring a man or a woman, the "old-boy network" operates in favor of the man. According to this view, women can get the job / only if they agree to accept lower wages. Consider this fact, however: For more than forty years, / it has been illegal to discriminate in the workforce / on the basis of race or gender. As interpreted by the courts, / the law now says / that if the statistical appearance of lower wages for women or minorities / is present in a workplace, / the employer is presumed to be guilty of discrimination / and must prove otherwise.

No one thinks / that federal agencies do a perfect job / at enforcing the law here or elsewhere, / but it is hard to believe / that a persistent 20 percent pay difference / could escape the notice of even the most nearsighted federal bureaucrat.

A hint of what might be going on / begins to emerge / when economists study the payroll records of individual firms, / using actual employee information / that is specific and detailed / regarding location of the firm, type of work, employee responsibilities, and other factors. These analyses reveal / that the so-called wage gap between men and women / is much smaller / — typically no more than 5 percent — and often / there is no gap at all. The sharp contrast / between firm-level data and nationwide data suggests / that something may be at work here / besides outright gender discrimination.